

PATENT

Application Serial No. 10/791,029
Attorney Docket No. 03-013

R E M A R K S

Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for contacting Applicants in order to expedite the allowance of the pending claims. Discussed during the interview conducted on August 1, 2005 was claim 1 and claim 23. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the Examiner believed the amendments previously made overcame the cited combination of references (Kamikow and Singer) but requested amendments to the claims to clarify the subject matter thereof and to improve the readability thereof. Accordingly, it is Applicants intent and understanding that the amendments agreed to during this interview, and made herein, are not made for any reason related to patentability but are merely clarifying and made to improve the readability of the claims. For example, Applicants have simplified the independent claims to refer to "a" non-linear outcome rather than "a plurality of" outcomes. However, a first display or display operable to display a plurality of outcomes is still within the scope of the claims. This is evidenced, for example, by the dependent claims that have been amended to refer to the first display or display being operable to display a plurality of outcomes, one of which is the non-linear outcome. This is also in compliance with case law that states that "a" refers to "one or more". It is therefore Applicants intent herein to improve the readability of the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions without narrowing the scope of the claims from the scope prior to the amendments made herein.

Applicants note that in the Interview Summary mailed on August 08, 2005, the Examiner writes that "Kamikow" and "Singer" were discussed during the interview. Applicants respectfully submit that, in accordance with Applicants notes and recollection of the interview, Kamikow and Singer were only briefly mentioned to the extent that the Examiner indicated that the subject

PATENT

Application Serial No. 10/791,029
Attorney Docket No. 03-013

matter of the claims was patentable over the combination of these references but would like to see the claims clarifyingly amended to improve the readability thereof. Further, Applicants agree with the Examiner's statement in the Interview Summary that it was agreed during the interview that the proposed amendments "appeared to distinguish over both Kamikow and Singer." Applicants would like to respectfully add to this statement, however, that it was further Applicants' understanding that the Examiner indicated that the claims as amended in response to the previous Office Action were also directed to subject matter that was patentable over Kamikow and Singer, but that the Examiner would like to improve the readability of the claims. Accordingly, as stated above, it is Applicants understanding that the present amendments were not necessitated for any reason related to patentability.

Further, in the Interview Summary the Examiner directs Applicants attention to FIGS. 6A and 6B and FIGS. 8A and 8B of Singer. Applicants respectfully agree with the Examiner that the present claims are patentable over Singer even in light of these FIGS. FIGS. 6A and 6B illustrate one embodiment of Singer, in which 58 paylines are illustrated via 58 distinct displays of the reels, wherein some of the paylines are non-linear. FIGS. 8A and 8B illustrate another embodiment of Singer, in which 58 paylines are again illustrated via 58 distinct displays of the reels. However, in FIGS. 8A and 8B, each of the 58 paylines is linear. However, these are two distinct embodiments of Singer that merely illustrate that one can choose to either, in accordance with the first embodiment, show the 58 distinct paylines as non-linear or, in accordance with the second embodiment, show the 58 distinct paylines as linear. Nothing in Singer teaches or suggests displaying a non-linear outcome via a first display of a gaming device and displaying the non-linear outcome as a linear outcome via a second display of the gaming device or a supplemental display of the gaming device, as is claimed.

PATENT

Application Serial No. 10/791,029
Attorney Docket No. 03-013**CONCLUSION**


For the foregoing reasons it is submitted that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact Magdalena M. Fincham at telephone number (203) 461-7041 or via electronic mail at mfincham@walkerdigital.com.

Applicants do not believe any fee (e.g., for an extension of time with which to respond to the Office Action) or petition for an extension of time is required at this time. However, if a fee should be necessary for the present Application at this time (or any time during the prosecution of the present Application), please charge any such required fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-0271. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0271. Further, if a petition for any extension of time should be required, please grant such petition as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

August 18, 2005
Date


Magdalena M. Fincham
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,085
mfincham@walkerdigital.com
(203) 461-7041 / voice
(203) 461-7300 / fax